arXiv:1407.3567v2 [quant-ph] 12 Nov 2014

The strong converse exponent of quantum hypothesis testing for correlated quantum states

Milán Mosonyi[1,2,*] and Tomohiro Ogawa[3,†]

[1] *Física Teòrica: Informació i Fenomens Quàntics, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, ES-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain.*
[2] *Mathematical Institute, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Egry József u 1., Budapest, 1111 Hungary.*
[3] *Graduate School of Information Systems, University of Electro-Communications, 1-5-1 Chofugaoka, Chofu-shi, Tokyo, 182-8585, Japan.*

We present two general approaches to obtain the strong converse exponent of quantum hypothesis testing for correlated quantum states. One approach requires that the states satisfy a certain factorization property; typical examples of such states are the temperature states of translation-invariant finite-range interactions on a spin chain. The other approach requires the differentiability of a regularized Rényi α-divergence in the parameter α; typical examples of such states include temperature states of non-interacting fermionic lattice systems, and classical irreducible Markov chains. In all cases, we get that the strong converse exponent is equal to the Hoeffding anti-divergence, which in turn is obtained from the regularized Rényi divergences of the two states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Assume that we have a quantum system with finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and we know that the system is either prepared in the state ρ_1 (*null-hypothesis* H_0), or in the state σ_1 (*alternative hypothesis* H_1). We further assume that we have access to several identical copies of the system, either all prepared in state ρ_1, or all prepared in state σ_1; for n copies this means that the state of the system is given by $\rho_n := \rho_1^{\otimes n}$ or by $\sigma_n := \sigma_1^{\otimes n}$. Our task is to decide which hypothesis is true, by performing measurements on the system. It is easy to see that the most general decision scheme can be described by a binary POVM (*positive operator-valued measure*), with POVM elements $T(0) = T$ corresponding to accepting the null-hypothesis, and $T(1) = I - T$ corresponding to accepting the alternative hypothesis. Here we assume that we are allowed to make collective measurements on all the available copies, i.e., T can be any positive semidefinite operator on $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$, satisfying $T \leq I$. Such an operator is called a *test*. Obviously, the test T and the POVM $(T, I - T)$ uniquely determine each other.

There are two possible ways of making an erroneous decision; either by accepting H_1 when H_0 is true (*type I error*), or the other way around (*type II error*). For a test T, the probabilities of these errors are given by

$$\alpha_n(T) := \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n(I-T), \quad \text{(type I)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \beta_n(T) := \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T, \quad \text{(type II)}.$$

Obviously, there is a trade-off between these two error probabilities, and there are various ways to jointly optimize them. Probably the most studied scenario is where the type I error is required to vanish in the asymptotics or, in a different formulation, to stay below a given threshold for all number of copies. The quantum *Stein's lemma* [22, 37] states that in both formulations, the best achievable asymptotics for the type II error is an exponential decay, where the exponent is given by the relative entropy $D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$.

To get a more detailed view of the trade-off between the two error probabilities, one may ask about the asymptotics of the type I error when the type II error is made to decay as $\sim e^{-nr}$, where r is a fixed rate below or above the optimal rate $D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$. As it turns out, for rates below $D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$, the best achievable asymptotics for the type I error is an exponential decay, with a rate

$$d(r|\rho\|\sigma) := \sup\left\{-\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\alpha_n(T_n) : \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n(T_n) < -r\right\} \tag{1}$$

$$= H_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) := \sup_{0<\alpha<1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - D_\alpha(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)\right]. \tag{2}$$

* milan.mosonyi@gmail.com
† ogawa@is.uec.ac.jp

Here, $d(r|\rho\|\sigma)$ is the *direct exponent* of the problem, $H_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ is the *Hoeffding divergence*, and $D_\alpha(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) := \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho_1^\alpha\sigma_1^{1-\alpha}$ is a quantum version of Rényi's α-divergence [38–40]. On the other hand, for rates above $D(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$, we see a *strong converse* behaviour; namely, the type I error not only does not vanish asymptotically, but it goes to 1 exponentially fast, and the best achievable exponent is

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) := \inf\left\{-\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log(1-\alpha_n(T_n)) : \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\beta_n(T_n) < -r\right\} \tag{3}$$

$$= H_r^*(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) := \sup_{1<\alpha}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - D_\alpha^*(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)\right]. \tag{4}$$

Here, $sc(r|\rho\|\sigma)$ is the *strong converse exponent* of the problem, $H_r^*(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ is the *Hoeffding anti-divergence*, and $D_\alpha^*(\rho_1\|\sigma_1) := \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_1^{1/2}\sigma_1^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}\rho_1^{1/2})^\alpha$ is an alternative version of the quantum Rényi divergence, recently introduced in [32, 44].

The expression for the direct exponent in the classical case (corresponding to commuting ρ_1 and σ_1) has been obtained in [7, 26]. The exponential decay of the type I error probabilities in the non-commuting case has been proved in [18], with bounds on $d(r|\rho\|\sigma)$ similar to (2) in form but with a different quantum version of the Rényi divergences. The correct form of the direct exponent has been obtained in [21, 34], based on techniques developed for the quantum Chernoff bound in [3, 4, 36]. The strong converse part of the quantum Stein's lemma has been first proved in [37], with a suboptimal bound on the strong converse exponent; the proof was later much simplified in [33]. The strong converse exponent was essentially determined in [20], in terms of an asymptotic post-measurement version of the D_α Rényi divergences. The expression (4) has been obtained recently in [30].

It is worth noting that two different notions of quantum Rényi divergence is needed to completely describe the trade-off curve. Indeed, the direct exponent is expressed in terms of the D_α divergences with $\alpha \in (0,1)$, whereas the strong converse exponent is a function of the D_α^* divergences with $\alpha > 1$. A more explicit operational interpretation of these divergences as generalized cutoff rates [10] has been given in [29, 30].

These results give a complete description of the trade-off between the exponents of the two error probabilities in the i.i.d. (independent and identically distributed) case described above. In reality, however, there may be correlations between the different copies. That is, while the state of the individual systems are still described by ρ_1 if H_0 is true, the global state of n copies may not be of the product form $\rho_1^{\otimes n}$ as assumed above, and similarly, σ_n might contain correlations among the different copies. A physically relevant example of such a scenario is where the consecutive copies are parts of a chain of particles governed by the translates of some local Hamiltonian, and ρ_n and σ_n are temperature (Gibbs) states of two different Hamiltonians.

Exact trade-off formulas for such states have been obtained in the direct domain in [24], where two general methods have been developed for the hypothesis testing of correlated states. The first method works if the states corresponding to both hypotheses satisfy a certain *factorization property*, which was shown to be satisfied by temperature states of translation-invariant finite-range Hamiltonians on a spin chain in [23]. The other method requires the existence of the regularized Rényi divergences $\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \lim_n (1/n)D_\alpha(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$, and differentiability of the limit in the parameter α. Typical examples of such states include classical irreducible Markov chains [13], certain finitely correlated states [15, 24], and temperature states of non-interacting fermions [27] and bosons [28] on a cubic lattice. In both cases, the trade-off formula is a direct generalization of (1)–(2), with $\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)$ in place of $D_\alpha(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$.

Here we show analogous results for the trade-off in the strong converse region. Namely, we show that (3)–(4) hold with $\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) := \lim_n (1/n)D_\alpha^*(\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$, $\alpha > 1$, in place of $D_\alpha^*(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ if one of two conditions is satisfied: (1) the states corresponding to both hypotheses satisfy the factorization property, or (2) the limit $\overline{D}_\alpha^*(\rho\|\sigma)$ exists for all $\alpha > 1$, it is a differentiable function of α, and it coincides with a variant of this limit, where ρ_n is block-diagonalized by the spectral projections of σ_n. The main examples satisfying the first condition are again the temperature states of translation-invariant finite-range Hamiltonians on a spin chain. The second condition is satisfied by the same class of classical Markov states and finitely correlated states as in the previous paragraph, as well as in the case where ρ is the temperature state of a non-interacting system of fermions on a cubic lattice, and σ is a product state.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section II we list some mathematical preliminaries. In Section III we summarize some properties of the quantum Rényi divergences, in Section III A we introduce their asymptotic versions, which is needed when dealing with correlated states, and in Section

III B we introduce the Hoeffding anti-divergence based on the asymptotic Rényi α-divergences. In Section IV we show that the Hoeffding anti-divergence is a lower bound on the strong converse rate, and that it is also an upper bound if any of the two conditions mentioned in the previous paragraph is satisfied. Section V is devoted to the study of physically motivated classes of correlated states where these conditions can be verified. Background material on classical large deviations, fermionic quasi-free states and Szegő's theorem is given in the Appendices.

II. PRELIMINARIES

For a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$, let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$ denote the set of non-zero positive semidefinite operators, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_{++}$ the set of positive definite operators on $\mathcal{H}$, and let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) := \{\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+ : \operatorname{Tr}\rho = 1\}$ be the set of *density operators* or *states*.

For a self-adjoint operator X on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, let $\{X \geq 0\}$ denote the spectral projection of X corresponding to the non-negative eigenvalues of X. The spectral projections $\{X > 0\}$, $\{X \leq 0\}$ and $\{X < 0\}$ are defined similarly. The positive part X_+ of X is defined as $X_+ := X\{X > 0\}$. It is easy to see that

$$\operatorname{Tr} X_+ = \max\{\operatorname{Tr} X : 0 \leq X \leq I\}, \tag{5}$$

a fact that we will use without further notice.

Lemma II.1 *For any Hermitian operators $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$,*

$$A \geq B \implies \operatorname{Tr} A_+ \geq \operatorname{Tr} B_+. \tag{6}$$

For any Hermitian operator A and any positive trace preserving map $\mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\operatorname{Tr} A_+ \geq \operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(A)_+ \tag{7}$$

Proof: The first assertion follows from

$$\operatorname{Tr} B_+ = \operatorname{Tr} B\{B > 0\} \leq \operatorname{Tr} A\{B > 0\} \leq \operatorname{Tr} A\{A > 0\},$$

where the first inequality is due to the assumption $B \leq A$, and the second is due to (5). The second assertion follows by

$$\operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(A)_+ = \operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{F}(A)\{\mathcal{F}(A) > 0\} = \operatorname{Tr} A\mathcal{F}^*(\{\mathcal{F}(A) > 0\}) \leq \operatorname{Tr} A\{A > 0\},$$

where $\mathcal{F}^*$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt adjoint of $\mathcal{F}$, and we used that $\mathcal{F}^*$ is positivity preserving and unital. □

We will follow the convention that powers of a positive semidefinite operator A are taken on its support only, and defined to be 0 on the orthocomplement of its support. That is, if $\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_r$ are the strictly positive eigenvalues of A with corresponding spectral projections $P_1, \ldots, P_r$, then $A^t := \sum_{i=1}^r \Lambda_i^t P_i$. In particular, A^0 denotes the projection onto the support of A, and $A^0 \leq B^0$ is a shorthand for $\operatorname{supp} A \subseteq \operatorname{supp} B$ when $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$. Similarly, we define $\log A$ to be 0 on the orthocomplement of A.

For an operator $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, we denote by $v(\sigma)$ the number of different eigenvalues of σ. If σ is self-adjoint with spectral projections $P_1, \ldots, P_r$, then the *pinching* by σ is the map $\mathcal{E}_\sigma : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_\sigma : X \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^r P_i X P_i, \qquad X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}).$$

The *pinching inequality* [19, 20] tells that if X is positive semidefinite then

$$X \leq v(\sigma)\mathcal{E}_\sigma(X). \tag{8}$$

III. RÉNYI DIVERGENCES AND RELATED QUANTITIES

For non-zero positive semidefinite operators ρ, σ on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, let

$$Q_t(\rho\|\sigma) := \operatorname{Tr}\rho^t\sigma^{1-t}, \qquad \psi(t|\rho\|\sigma) := \log Q_t(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad t \in \mathbb{R},$$
$$Q_t^*(\rho\|\sigma) := \operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^t, \qquad \psi^*(t|\rho\|\sigma) := \log Q_t^*(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad t > 0.$$

In the following, let $\{v\}$ denote either $\{\ \}$ or $\{*\}$. When ρ and σ commute, the expressions with and without $\{*\}$ coincide, and therefore we omit $\{*\}$ in the notation.

The *Rényi α-divergences* of ρ w.r.t. σ for parameter $\alpha \in [0,+\infty)\setminus\{1\}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma) &:= \lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma+\varepsilon I) - \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log\operatorname{Tr}\rho \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) - \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log\operatorname{Tr}\rho, & \rho^0 \le \sigma^0 \text{ or } \ \alpha \in (0,1), \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The equality above is straightforward to verify for $\{v\} = \{\ \}$, and it follows from Lemma 12 in [32] for $\{v\} = \{*\}$. For $\alpha = 1$ we define

$$D_1(\rho\,\|\,\sigma) := \lim_{\alpha\to 1} D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\,\|\,\sigma) = D(\rho\|\sigma) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\operatorname{Tr}\rho}\left[\operatorname{Tr}\rho\log\rho - \operatorname{Tr}\rho\log\sigma\right], & \rho^0 \le \sigma^0, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Note that $D(\rho\|\sigma)$ is the *relative entropy* [38, 42, 43] of ρ w.r.t. σ. The above limit relation for D_α is straightforward to verify, and for D_α^* it has been shown by different methods in [31, 32, 44]. We also provide a proof for it below. It has been shown in [32] that

$$D_\infty^*(\rho\,\|\,\sigma) := \lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} D_\alpha^*(\rho\,\|\,\sigma) = \inf\{\gamma :\ \rho \le e^\gamma\sigma\},$$

which is nothing else but the max-relative entropy of ρ w.r.t. σ [12, 41].

Lemma III.1 *Let ρ and σ be such that $\rho\sigma \neq 0$. Then $\psi^{\{v\}}(.|\rho\|\sigma)$ is differentiable on $(0,+\infty)$, and*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\psi(t|\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{1}{Q_t(\rho\|\sigma)}\operatorname{Tr}\rho^t\sigma^{1-t}(\log\rho - \log\sigma), \tag{10}$$
$$\frac{d}{dt}\psi^*(t|\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{1}{Q_t^*(\rho\|\sigma)}\left[\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^t\log\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) - \frac{1}{t}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{t-1}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}(\log\sigma)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]. \tag{11}$$

Moreover, (10) *is valid for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof: The derivative of ψ is straightforward to compute. To see the derivative of ψ^*, let

$$g :\ \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\oplus\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \qquad g :\ t \mapsto t \oplus \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which has derivative

$$\frac{d}{dt}g(t) = 1 \oplus \left(-\frac{1}{t^2}\right)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}(\log\sigma)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Note that for every $t > 0$, there exist $c_t, d_t > 0$ such that $c_t\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^0\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \le d_t\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^0\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and thus $(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}})^0 = (\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^0\rho^{\frac{1}{2}})^0 =: P$, independently of t. Define

$$f :\ \mathbb{R}\oplus\mathcal{B}(P\mathcal{H})_{++} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad t \oplus X \mapsto \operatorname{Tr}X^t,$$

the derivative of which at a point (t, X) is the linear map

$$df(t,X) :\ (s,Y) \mapsto s\operatorname{Tr}X^t\log X + t\operatorname{Tr}X^{t-1}Y.$$

The second term above can be obtained e.g. from Theorem V.3.3 in [5]. Using the chain rule for derivatives, we get that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^t = \frac{d}{dt}f(g(t)) = \operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^t \log\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) - \frac{1}{t}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{t-1}\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\sigma^{\frac{1-t}{t}}(\log\sigma)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which yields (11). □

Corollary III.2 *The limit relation in* (9) *holds.*

Proof: Assume first that $\rho^0 \le \sigma^0$. Then we have $D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)-\psi^{\{v\}}(1|\rho\|\sigma)}{\alpha-1}$, and hence

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 1} D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{d}{d\alpha}\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)\Big|_{\alpha=1} = D(\rho\|\sigma),$$

where the last equality is due to lemma III.1. Assume next that $\rho^0 \not\le \sigma^0$. Then $D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma) = +\infty = D(\rho\|\sigma)$ for every $\alpha > 1$. On the other hand, $\psi^{\{v\}}(1|\rho\|\sigma) = \log\operatorname{Tr}\rho\sigma^0 < \log\operatorname{Tr}\rho$, and hence for $\alpha < 1$ we have

$$D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) - \psi^{\{v\}}(1|\rho\|\sigma)}{\alpha-1} + \frac{\log\operatorname{Tr}\rho\sigma^0 - \log\operatorname{Tr}\rho}{\alpha-1}.$$

The first term has a finite limit, again due to lemma III.1, while the second term goes to $+\infty = D(\rho\|\sigma)$ as $\alpha \nearrow 1$. □

Lemma III.3 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$ be such that $\rho^0 \le \sigma^0$. For every $\alpha > 1$,*

$$\psi^*(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\psi(\alpha|\mathcal{E}_{\sigma^{\otimes n}}\rho^{\otimes n}\|\sigma^{\otimes n}), \tag{12}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma^{\otimes n}}$ is the pinching by $\sigma^{\otimes n}$. In particular, $\alpha \mapsto \psi^*(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ is convex.

Proof: The limit relation (12) is due to Theorem III.7 in [30]. By (12), $\psi^*(.|\rho\|\sigma)$ is the pointwise limit of convex functions, and hence itself is convex on $(1, +\infty)$. □

It is easy to see (by simply computing its second derivative) that for fixed $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$, the function $\alpha \mapsto \psi(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ is convex on $\mathbb{R}$. When combined with the above lemma, we get

Corollary III.4 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$ be such that $\rho^0 \le \sigma^0$. Then $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma)$ is monotone increasing on $(1, +\infty)$, and*

$$D_1(\rho\|\sigma) = \inf_{\alpha>1} D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma). \tag{13}$$

Proof: Note that $\rho^0 \le \sigma^0$ implies that $D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)-\psi^{\{v\}}(1|\rho\|\sigma)}{\alpha-1}$, and hence convexity of $\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ in α yields that $\alpha \mapsto D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma)$ is a monotone increasing function of α; in particular, (13) holds. □

The D_α Rényi divergences are known to be monotone non-increasing under completely positive trace-preserving maps for $\alpha \in [0, 2]$. Monotonicity for the D_α^* Rényi divergences has been proved for different ranges of α and with different methods in [6, 16, 25, 30, 32, 44]:

Lemma III.5 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$ and $\phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ be a linear completely positive trace-preserving map. Then*

$$D_\alpha^*(\phi(\rho)\|\phi(\sigma)) \le D_\alpha^*(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad \alpha \in [1/2, +\infty].$$

The following lemma is straightforward to verify:

Lemma III.6 *Let $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$ and $\lambda, \kappa > 0$. For every $\alpha \in [0, +\infty]$,*

$$\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\lambda\rho\|\kappa\sigma) = \alpha\log\lambda + (1-\alpha)\log\kappa + \psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma), \tag{14}$$

$$D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\lambda\rho\|\kappa\sigma) = \log\lambda - \log\kappa + D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\rho\|\sigma). \tag{15}$$

A. Asymptotic Rényi quantities

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let ρ_n and σ_n be states on some finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_n$, and let $\rho := \{\rho_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma := \{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. We will assume throughout that

$$\operatorname{supp}\rho_n \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\sigma_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \qquad \text{which we abbreviate as} \qquad \operatorname{supp}\rho \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\sigma.$$

Recall that $v(\sigma_n)$ denotes the number of different eigenvalues of σ_n, and let $\widehat{\rho}_n := \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_n}(\rho_n)$ denote the pinching of ρ_n by σ_n. By the pinching inequality (8), we have

$$\rho_n \le v(\sigma_n)\widehat{\rho}_n.$$

We define the asymptotic Rényi quantities

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) &:= \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\psi^*(\alpha|\rho_n\|\sigma_n), & \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) &:= \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\psi(\alpha|\widehat{\rho}_n\|\sigma_n), \\ \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) &:= \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma), & \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) &:= \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

When $\alpha > 1$, we can also write

$$\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} D^*_\alpha(\rho_n\|\sigma_n), \qquad \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_\alpha(\widehat{\rho}_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{17}$$

Lemma III.7 *$\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ and $\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ are convex in α on $(1,+\infty)$, the functions*

$$\alpha \mapsto \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \mapsto \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) \quad \text{are monotone increasing,} \tag{18}$$

and hence

$$\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma) := \inf_{\alpha>1} \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha\searrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma) = \sup_{\alpha>1} \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma), \tag{19}$$

$$\widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma) := \inf_{\alpha>1} \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha\searrow 1} \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad \widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma) = \sup_{\alpha>1} \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \lim_{\alpha\to+\infty} \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma). \tag{20}$$

Proof: Both $\overline{\psi}$ and $\widehat{\psi}$ are the limsup of convex functions, and hence are convex. Note that $\operatorname{supp}\rho \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\sigma$ implies $\overline{\psi}(1|\rho\|\sigma) = 0$, and hence $\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \frac{1}{\alpha-1}(\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) - \overline{\psi}(1|\rho\|\sigma))$. From this (18) follows for $\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)$, and the proof for $\widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)$ goes exactly the same way. □

We say that $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ (resp., $\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$) exists as a limit, if the corresponding limsup in (16) can be replaced with a limit. By the proof of Theorem III.7 in [30], we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\psi^*(\alpha|\rho_n\|\sigma_n) - \frac{\alpha}{n}\log v(\sigma_n) \le \frac{1}{n}\psi(\alpha|\widehat{\rho}_n\|\sigma_n) \le \frac{1}{n}\psi^*(\alpha|\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \tag{21}$$

for every $\alpha > 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. As a consequence, we obtain the following:

Lemma III.8 *Assume that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log v(\sigma_n) = 0$. Then*

$$\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma),$$

and $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ exists as a limit if and only if $\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ exists as a limit.

B. Generalized Legendre transforms

In this section we consider the extension of H^*_r in (4) to general correlated states. First we present a more general definition, corresponding to a general convex function f, and we will obtain the desired quantity by specializing to $f = \overline{\psi}$.

For what follows, let $f : [1, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a non-negative convex function such that $f(1) = 0$, and let

$$f_\circ(a) := \sup_{t>1}\{a(t-1) - f(t)\}, \qquad a \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{22}$$

$$H^*_{f,r} := \sup_{t>1} \frac{r(t-1) - f(t)}{t} = \sup_{0<s<1} \left\{ sr - (1-s) f\left(\frac{1}{1-s}\right)\right\}, \qquad r \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{23}$$

Note that $a \mapsto f_\circ(a) + a$ is the *Legendre-Fenchel transform* (or *polar transform*) of f on $(1, +\infty)$, and $r \mapsto H^*_{f,r}$ is the Legendre-Fenchel transform of $s \mapsto (1-s) f\left(\frac{1}{1-s}\right)$ on $(0, 1)$. Let

$$D_{f,1} := a_{f,\min} := \inf_{1<t<+\infty} \frac{f(t)}{t-1} = \lim_{t \searrow 1} \frac{f(t)}{t-1} = \partial^+ f(1), \quad \text{and} \qquad r_{f,\min} := f_\circ(a_{f,\min}) + a_{f,\min}, \tag{24}$$

$$D_{f,\infty} := a_{f,\max} := \sup_{1<t<+\infty} \frac{f(t)}{t-1} = \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{f(t)}{t-1}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad r_{f,\max} := f_\circ(a_{f,\max}) + a_{f,\max}. \tag{25}$$

Note that $a_{f,\min}$ is always finite, whereas $a_{f,\max}$ can be $+\infty$, in which case also $r_{f,\max} = +\infty$.

Lemma III.9 *For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$f_\circ(a) \geq 0, \qquad \textit{and} \qquad f_\circ(a) > 0 \iff a > \partial^+ f(1). \tag{26}$$

For any $r \in [0, +\infty)$, we have

$$0 \leq H^*_{f,r} = \begin{cases} r - a_r = f_\circ(a_r), & r < f_\circ(a_{f,\max}) + a_{f,\max}, \\ r - a_{f,\max}, & r \geq f_\circ(a_{f,\max}) + a_{f,\max}, \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

where a_r is the unique solution of $r - a_r = f_\circ(a_r)$. Moreover,

$$0 < H^*_{f,r} \iff r > \partial^+ f(1) = a_{f,\min} = r_{f,\min}. \tag{28}$$

Proof: Non-negativity of $f_\circ(a)$ and H^*_r are obvious from their definitions (22) and (23) and the fact that $f(1) = 0$. Due to the convexity of f, $t \mapsto \frac{f(t)}{t-1} = \frac{f(t)-f(1)}{t-1}$ is monotone increasing, proving the equalities of the limits and the infimum/supremum in (24) and (25). There exists a $t > 1$ such that $a(t-1) - f(t) > 0$ if and only if $a > \inf_{t>1} \frac{f(t)}{t-1} = \partial^+ f(1)$, proving (26). In particular, $f_\circ(a_{f,\min}) = 0$, and hence $a_{f,\min} = r_{f,\min}$, proving the last identity in (28). Non-negativity of H^*_r and the rest of (28) follows the same way as (26). Hence, we have to prove the identities in (27).

First, we consider the case $0 \leq r < r_{f,\max}$. Note that $a \mapsto f_\circ(a) + a$ is strictly increasing and continuous on $[0, a_{f,\max})$, and hence for every $0 \leq r < r_{f,\max}$ there exists a unique a_r such that $r = f_\circ(a_r) + a_r$. By definition,

$$f_\circ(a_r) \geq a_r(t-1) - f(t) = (t-1)(r - f_\circ(a_r)) - f(t), \qquad t \geq 1,$$

and equality holds in the above inequality for some $t_r \in [1, +\infty)$. Rearranging, we get

$$f_\circ(a_r) \geq \frac{r(t-1) - f(t)}{t}, \qquad t \geq 1,$$

with equality for t_r, and hence

$$f_\circ(a_r) = \max_{t \geq 1} \frac{r(t-1) - f(t)}{t} = H^*_r.$$

Next, assume that $r \geq r_{f,\max}$. Since $r < +\infty$ by assumption, we only have to consider the case $r_{f,\max} < +\infty$, which implies $a_{f,\max} < +\infty$. Note that

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{r(t-1) - f(t)}{t} = r - \lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{t-1}{t} \frac{f(t)}{t-1} = r - a_{f,\max}. \tag{29}$$

Hence it is enough to show that

$$\frac{r(t-1)-f(t)}{t} \leq r - a_{f,\max} \tag{30}$$

for every $t > 1$. Note that $r \geq r_{f,\max} = f_\circ(a_{f,\max}) + a_{f,\max}$ implies

$$r - a_{f,\max} \geq f_\circ(a_{f,\max}) \geq a_{f,\max}(t-1) - f(t) \tag{31}$$

for every $t > 1$, from which we obtain

$$\frac{r+f(t)}{t} \geq a_{f,\max}. \tag{32}$$

Thus we have

$$r - a_{f,\max} \geq r - \frac{r+f(t)}{t} = \frac{r(t-1)-f(t)}{t}, \tag{33}$$

and hence $H_r^* = r - a_{f,\max}$, as required. □

We will mainly be interested in the above general Legendre-Fenchel transforms when $f = \overline{\psi}$ or $f = \widehat{\psi}$. In these special cases we have

$$\phi(a) := \overline{\psi}_\circ(a) = \sup_{\alpha>1}\{a(\alpha-1) - \overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)\} \tag{34}$$

$$\widehat{\phi}(a) := \widehat{\psi}_\circ(a) = \sup_{\alpha>1}\{a(\alpha-1) - \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)\}, \qquad a \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{35}$$

and for every ≥ 0,

$$H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) := H^*_{\overline{\psi},r} = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{r(\alpha-1) - \overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)}{\alpha} = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)\right],$$

$$\widehat{H}_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) := H^*_{\widehat{\psi},r} = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{r(\alpha-1) - \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)}{\alpha} = \sup_{\alpha>1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r - \widehat{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma)\right].$$

Note that

$$D_{\overline{\psi},1} = \overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \quad D_{\overline{\psi},\infty} = \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad \text{and} \qquad D_{\widehat{\psi},1} = \widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \quad D_{\widehat{\psi},\infty} = \widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma).$$

By lemma III.9, we have

$$0 \leq H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) = \begin{cases} r - a_r = \phi(a_r), & r < \phi(a_{\max}) + a_{\max}, \\ r - a_{\max}, & r \geq \phi(a_{\max}) + a_{\max}, \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

where a_r is the unique solution of $r - a_r = \phi(a_r)$ and $a_{\max} = \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)$, and

$$0 < H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) \iff r > \overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma). \tag{37}$$

The same relations hold for $\widehat{H}_r^*(\rho\|\sigma)$ with $\widehat{\phi}$, $\widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma)$ and $\widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)$ in place of ϕ, $\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma)$ and $\overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)$, respectively.

We call $H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma)$ the *Hoeffding anti-divergence* of ρ and σ with parameter r. It differs from the (regularized) Hoeffding divergence [4, 21, 24, 34] in two ways: first, it is based on the D_α^* Rényi divergences instead of D_α, and second, the optimization is over $\alpha > 1$ instead of $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Due to the latter it is monotone non-decreasing under completely positive trace-preserving maps, which is the reason why we call it an anti-divergence.

IV. THE STRONG CONVERSE EXPONENT IN BINARY HYPOTHESIS TESTING

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let ρ_n and σ_n be states on some finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_n$, and let $\rho := \{\rho_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma := \{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. As before, we assume that $\operatorname{supp}\rho \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\sigma$, i.e., $\operatorname{supp}\rho_n \subseteq \operatorname{supp}\sigma_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For every parameter $r > 0$, the *strong converse exponent* $sc(r|\rho\|\sigma)$ of the hypothesis testing problem with null-hypothesis ρ and alternative hypothesis σ is defined as

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) := \inf\left\{ -\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n : \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n \le -r \right\},$$

where the optimum is over all sequences of tests $T_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_n)_+$, $T_n \le I$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. (1)). It is easy to see that the strong converse exponent can be alternatively expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) &= \sup\Big\{ R \,\Big|\, \forall\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty},\ 0 \le T_n \le I, \\ &\qquad \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n \le -r \ \Rightarrow\ \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n \le -R \Big\} \\ &= \inf\Big\{ R \,\Big|\, \exists\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty},\ 0 \le T_n \le I, \\ &\qquad \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n \le -r,\ \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n \ge -R \Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The following lemma is essentially due to [33] and [20], the only difference is that we use D^*_α instead of D_α.

Lemma IV.1 *For any $r \ge 0$, we have $sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) \ge H^*_r(\rho\|\sigma)$.*

Proof: Let $T_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_n)$ be a test and let $p_n := (\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n, \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n(I - T_n))$ and $q_n := (\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n, \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n(I - T_n))$ be the post-measurement probability distributions. By the monotonicity of the Rényi divergences under measurements, we have, for any $\alpha > 1$,

$$D^*_\alpha(\rho_n \,\|\, \sigma_n) \ge D_\alpha(p_n \,\|\, q_n) \ge \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log\left[(\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n)^\alpha (\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n)^{1-\alpha}\right] = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n - \log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n,$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n \le \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[\frac{1}{n}D^*_\alpha(\rho_n \,\|\, \sigma_n) + \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n\right].$$

If $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n \le -r$ then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n \le \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) - r\right], \qquad \alpha > 1.$$

Taking the infimum in $\alpha > 1$, the assertion follows. □

It is known that the inequality in Lemma IV.1 holds as an equality in the i.i.d. case [30], and our aim is to extend this equality to various correlated scenarios. We start with the following general converse:

Theorem IV.2 *Let $f : [0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function such that $f(1) = 0$. Assume that for every $a \in (D_{f,1}, D_{f,\infty})$ there exists a sequence of tests $0 \le T_n(a) \le I_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n T_n(a) \le -(f_\circ(a) + a), \tag{39}$$

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\log \operatorname{Tr}\rho_n T_n(a) \ge -f_\circ(a). \tag{40}$$

Then

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) \le H^*_{f,r}, \qquad r \ge 0. \tag{41}$$

Proof: Due to the representation (38) of $sc(r|\rho\|\sigma)$ as an infimum of rates, it is sufficient to show that for any rate $R > H^*_{f,r}$ there exists a sequence of tests $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n T_n \le -r \qquad \text{and} \qquad \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n T_n \ge -R. \tag{42}$$

We prove the claim by considering three different regions of r.

(i) In the case $\overline{D}_{f,1} < r < r_{f,\max}$, there exists a unique $a_r \in (\overline{D}_{f,1}, \overline{D}_{f,\infty})$ satisfying $r - a_r = f_\circ(a_r)$, and (43) and (44) yield

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n T_n(a_r) \le -(f_\circ(a_r) + a_r) = -r,$$
$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n T_n(a_r) \ge -f_\circ(a_r) = H^*_{f,r},$$

where the last identity is due to (36).

(ii) In the case $0 \le r \le \overline{D}_{f,1}$, we have $H^*_{f,r} = 0$, according to (37). For any $R > 0$, we can find an $a \in (\overline{D}_{f,1}, \overline{D}_{f,\infty})$ such that $0 < f_\circ(a) < R$. Note that $f_\circ(a) + a > \overline{D}_{f,1} \ge r$, and (43) and (44) yield

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n T_n(a) \le -(f_\circ(a) + a) < -r,$$
$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n T_n(a) \ge -f_\circ(a) > -R.$$

(iii) In the case $r \ge r_{f,\max}$, we use a modification of the tests $T_n(a)$, following the method of the proof of Theorem 4 in [35]. For every $a, r \in \mathbb{R}$, let

$$T_n(r,a) := e^{-n\{r-a-f_\circ(a)\}} T_n(a).$$

If $a \in (\overline{D}_{f,1}, \overline{D}_{f,\infty})$ and $r \ge r_{f,\max}$ then $r > f_\circ(a) + a$, and hence $0 \le T_n(r,a) \le I$, i.e., $T_n(r,a)$ is a test, and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n T_n(r,a) \le -r + a + f_\circ(a) - (a + f_\circ(a)) = -r,$$
$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n T_n(r,a) \ge -r + a + f_\circ(a) - f_\circ(a) = -(r-a),$$

by (43) and (44). Now for any $R > H^*_{f,r} = r - \overline{D}_{f,\infty}$, we can find an $a \in (\overline{D}_{f,1}, \overline{D}_{f,\infty})$ such that $r - \overline{D}_{f,\infty} < r - a < R$, and the assertion follows.

□

Specializing to $f = \overline{\psi}$ in the above Theorem yields the following:

Theorem IV.3 *Assume that for every $a \in (\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma))$ there exists a sequence of tests $0 \le T_n(a) \le I_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_n T_n(a) \le -(\phi(a) + a), \tag{43}$$
$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathrm{Tr}\, \rho_n T_n(a) \ge -\phi(a), \tag{44}$$

where ϕ is given in (34)*. Then*

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) = H^*_r(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad r \ge 0. \tag{45}$$

Proof: Immediate from Lemma IV.1 and Theorem IV.2. □

A. States with differentiable $\overline{\psi} = \widehat{\psi}$

As before, let $\widehat{\rho}_n$ be the pinching of ρ_n by σ_n, and let

$$\widehat{S}_n(a) := \{\widehat{\rho}_n - e^{na}\sigma_n > 0\}$$

be a Neyman-Pearson test for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem IV.4 *Assume that for every $\alpha > 1$, $\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ exists as a limit, and $\alpha \mapsto \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ is differentiable on $(1, +\infty)$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = -(\widehat{\phi}(a) + a) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \rho_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = -\widehat{\phi}(a) \tag{46}$$

for every $a \in \big(\widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)\big)$, where $\widehat{\phi}$ is given in (35), and

$$H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma) \le sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) \le \widehat{H}_r^*(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad r \ge 0. \tag{47}$$

If, moreover, $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ for every $\alpha > 1$ then

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) = H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad r \ge 0.. \tag{48}$$

Proof: First, note that $\widehat{S}_n(a) = \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_n}(\widehat{S}_n(a))$, and hence

$$\operatorname{Tr} \rho_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = \operatorname{Tr} \rho_n \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_n}(\widehat{S}_n(a)) = \operatorname{Tr} \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_n}(\rho_n) \widehat{S}_n(a) = \operatorname{Tr} \widehat{\rho}_n \widehat{S}_n(a).$$

Since $\widehat{\rho}_n$ and σ_n commute, we may consider them as probability mass functions on some finite set $\mathcal{X}_n$, and write

$$\operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = \mathbb{P}_{\sigma_n}\left(\{x \in \mathcal{X}_n : Y_n(x) > a\}\right), \qquad \operatorname{Tr} \widehat{\rho}_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = \mathbb{P}_{\widehat{\rho}_n}\left(\{x \in \mathcal{X}_n : Y_n(x) > a\}\right),$$

where $Y_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\widehat{\rho}_n(x)}{\sigma_n(x)}$. Let $\Lambda_{n,1}$ and $\Lambda_{n,2}$ be the logarithmic moment generating function of Y_n w.r.t. σ_n and $\widehat{\rho}_n$, respectively. Then we have

$$\Lambda_{n,1}(nt) = \log \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_n} e^{t \log(\widehat{\rho}_n/\sigma_n)} = \log \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}_n} \widehat{\rho}_n(x)^t \sigma_n(\underline{x})^{1-t} = \log \operatorname{Tr} \widehat{\rho}_n^t \sigma_n^{1-t} = \psi(t|\widehat{\rho}_n\|\sigma_n),$$
$$\Lambda_{n,2}(nt) = \log \mathbb{E}_{\widehat{\rho}_n} e^{t \log(\widehat{\rho}_n/\sigma_n)} = \log \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}_n} \widehat{\rho}_n(x)^{1+t} \sigma_n(x)^{-t} = \log \operatorname{Tr} \widehat{\rho}_n^{1+t} \sigma_n^{-t} = \psi(1+t|\widehat{\rho}_n\|\sigma_n).$$

By assumption,

$$\overline{\Lambda}_1(t) := \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \Lambda_{n,1}(nt) = \widehat{\psi}(t|\rho\|\sigma), \qquad t > 1,$$
$$\overline{\Lambda}_2(t) := \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\Lambda}_{n,2}(nt) = \widehat{\psi}(1+t|\rho\|\sigma), \qquad t > 0.$$

By convexity, it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{t\searrow 1} \overline{\Lambda}_1'(t) = \widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{t\nearrow+\infty} \overline{\Lambda}_1'(t) \ge \widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma),$$

and, similarly,

$$\lim_{t\searrow 0} \overline{\Lambda}_2'(t) = \widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{t\nearrow+\infty} \overline{\Lambda}_2'(t) \ge \widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma).$$

Using now lemmas A.1 and A.2, we get that for every $a \in \big(\widehat{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \widehat{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)\big)$,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = -\sup_{t>1}\{at - \widehat{\psi}(t|\rho\|\sigma)\} = -(\widehat{\phi}(a) + a),$$
$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \rho_n \widehat{S}_n(a) = -\sup_{t>0}\{at - \widehat{\psi}(1+t|\rho\|\sigma)\} = -\widehat{\phi}(a),$$

proving (46).

Applying Theorem IV.2 with $f := \widehat{\psi}$ and $T_n(a) := \widehat{S}_n(a)$ yields the second inequality in (47), and the first inequality is immediate from Lemma IV.1. Finally, if $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ for every $\alpha > 1$ then $\widehat{H}^*_r(\rho\|\sigma) = H^*_r(\rho\|\sigma)$ for every r, and (47) reduces to (48). □

We say that the hypothesis testing problem is i.i.d. if $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}_1^{\otimes n}$, $\rho_n = \rho_1^{\otimes n}$ and $\sigma_n = \sigma_1^{\otimes n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $H^*_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ be as given in (4). The strong converse exponent in the i.i.d. case has been shown to be equal to $H^*_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ in [30], by showing that (46) holds with $S_n(a) := \{\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n > 0\}$ in place of $\widehat{S}_n(a)$. Here we give an alternative proof for $sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) = H^*_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$, based on Theorem IV.4.

Theorem IV.5 *In the i.i.d. case, $sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) = H^*_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ for every $r \geq 0$.*

Proof: It is easy to see that the i.i.d. assumption implies $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \psi^*(\alpha|\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$, and thus also $H^*_r(\rho\|\sigma) = H^*_r(\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$. Moreover, $v(\sigma_1^{\otimes n})$ grows polynomially with n, and hence, by Lemma III.8, $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$. Finally, differentiability of $\psi^*(\alpha|\rho_1\|\sigma_1)$ in α for $\alpha > 1$ follows from Lemma III.1. Thus, all the conditions of Theorem IV.4 are satisfied, and therefore (48) holds. □

In [24, Example B.1] a class of finitely correlated states [15] with commutative auxiliary algebra has been studied, and it has been shown that for these states, $\lim_n (1/n)\psi(\alpha|\rho_n\|\sigma_n)$ is differentiable in α for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, this class includes classical Markov chains with an irreducible transition matrix. Exactly the same argument as in [24] yields that for this class of states, also $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ exists as a limit and is differentiable in α for $\alpha > 1$. It is also easy to verify that if σ is in this class then $\lim_n (1/n)v(\sigma_n) = 0$, and thus $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) = \widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ due to Lemma III.8. In particular, the strong converse exponent can be expressed as in (48), due to Theorem IV.4.

In Section V B we show a further class of states to which Theorem IV.4 can be applied.

B. States with factorization property

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let ω_n be a state on $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. We say that $\omega := \{\omega_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the *factorization property* if there exists an $\eta \geq 1$ such that for every $k, m, r \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\omega_{km+r} \leq \eta^k \omega_m^{\otimes k} \otimes \omega_r \qquad \text{(upper factorization), and}$$
$$\omega_{km+r} \geq \eta^{-k} \omega_m^{\otimes k} \otimes \omega_r \qquad \text{(lower factorization).}$$

We call η a *factorization constant* for ω. Note that if $\rho = \{\rho_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma = \{\sigma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ both satisfy the factorization property then we can always choose an η which is a common factorization constant for both ρ and σ.

Obviously, if ω is i.i.d., i.e., of the form $\omega_n = \omega_1^{\otimes n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then it satisfies the factorization property with $\eta = 1$. It has been shown in [23] that finitely correlated states [15] satisfy the upper factorization property, but not necessarily the lower factorization property. In particular, if ω is a classical Markov chain then it satisfies both the upper and the lower factorization property if and only if all the entries of its transition matrix are strictly positive. Physically relevant examples of states with the factorization property are the Gibbs states of translation-invariant finite-range interactions on a spin chain; for details, see Section V A.

In this section we show that if both ρ and σ satisfy the factorization property then the tests $T_n(a) := S_n(a)$, where

$$S_n(a) := \{\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n > 0\}$$

are the quantum Neyman-Pearson tests, satisfy (43) and (44), and hence (45) holds.

We start with showing that under the factorization assumption, $\overline{\psi}$ exists as a limit, and give bounds on its deviation from the ψ functions for finite n.

Lemma IV.6 *Let ρ and σ satisfy the factorization property, and let η be a common factorization constant. Then $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ exists as a limit for every $\alpha > 1$, and*

$$\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) - \frac{2\alpha-1}{n}\log\eta \leq \frac{1}{n}\psi^*(\alpha|\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \leq \overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) + \frac{2\alpha-1}{n}\log\eta \tag{49}$$

for every $\alpha > 1$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ can be uniquely written in the form $n = km + r$ with $k, r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$. Since $\alpha > 1$, we have $-1 < \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} < 0$, and hence $x \mapsto x^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}$ is operator monotone decreasing. Thus

$$\eta^{-k\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k} \otimes \sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \leq \sigma_n^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} \leq \eta^{k\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k} \otimes \sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}. \tag{50}$$

Taking into account that $A \mapsto \operatorname{Tr} A^\alpha$ is monotone increasing w.r.t. the positive semidefinite ordering, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_\alpha^*(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) &= \operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n^{1/2}\sigma_n^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\rho_n^{1/2}\right)^\alpha \leq \eta^{k(\alpha-1)} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\rho_n^{1/2}\left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k}\otimes\sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\rho_n^{1/2}\right)^\alpha \\
&= \eta^{k(\alpha-1)} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k}\otimes\sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\rho_n\left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k}\otimes\sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right)^\alpha \\
&\leq \eta^{k\alpha}\eta^{k(\alpha-1)} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k}\otimes\sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\left(\rho_m^{\otimes k}\otimes\rho_r\right)\left(\sigma_m^{\otimes k}\otimes\sigma_r\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right)^\alpha \\
&= \eta^{k(2\alpha-1)} Q_\alpha^*(\rho_m\|\sigma_m)^k Q_\alpha(\rho_r\|\sigma_r),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log Q_\alpha^*(\rho_n\|\sigma_n) \leq \frac{2\alpha-1}{m}\log\eta + \frac{1}{m}\log Q_\alpha^*(\rho_m\|\sigma_m).$$

Taking now the liminf in m, we get that $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma)$ exists as a limit, and the first inequality in (49) holds, for every $\alpha > 1$. Using the lower factorization for ρ and upper factorization for σ, an analogous argument to the one above yields the second inequality in (49). □

Corollary IV.7 *For every $\alpha \in (1, +\infty)$, we have*

$$\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma) = \lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}D_\alpha^*(\rho_n\|\sigma_n). \tag{51}$$

Lemma IV.8 *Assume that ρ and σ satisfy the factorization property. Then*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a) \leq -\phi(a), \tag{52}$$

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n S_n(a) \leq -(\phi(a)+a). \tag{53}$$

for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof: First, we prove that

$$\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a) \leq e^{-na(\alpha-1)} Q_\alpha^*(\rho_n||\sigma_n) \tag{54}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, this inequality holds trivially if $S_n(a) = 0$. Otherwise we can use

$$\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a) \geq e^{na}\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n S_n(a), \tag{55}$$

to show that for $\alpha \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a) &= \{\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a)\}^{\alpha}\{\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a)\}^{1-\alpha}\\ &\leq e^{na(1-\alpha)}\{\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a)\}^{\alpha}\{\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n S_n(a)\}^{1-\alpha}\\ &\leq e^{-na(\alpha-1)}\left[\{\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a)\}^{\alpha}\{\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n S_n(a)\}^{1-\alpha}+\{\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n(I_n-S_n(a))\}^{\alpha}\{\operatorname{Tr}\sigma_n(I_n-S_n(a))\}^{1-\alpha}\right]\\ &\leq e^{-na(\alpha-1)}Q^*_\alpha(\rho_n\|\sigma_n),\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma III.5. From (54) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a) \leq -\left\{a(\alpha-1)-\frac{1}{n}\log Q^*_\alpha(\rho_n||\sigma_n)\right\},$$

and taking the limsup in n and the infimum over $\alpha>1$ yields the (52). Finally, combining (55) with (52) yields (53). □

Lemma IV.9 *For any $A,B\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$, and any $c\in(D_1(A\|B),D^*_\infty(A\|B))$, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^{\otimes n}-e^{nc}B^{\otimes n}\right)_+ = -\sup_{\alpha>1}\{c(\alpha-1)-\psi^*(\alpha|A\|B)\}.$$

Proof: When $\operatorname{Tr}A=\operatorname{Tr}B=1$, the assertion follows from Theorem IV.4 in [30]. In general, let $\tilde{A}:=A/\operatorname{Tr}A$, $\tilde{B}:=B/\operatorname{Tr}B$. Then

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^{\otimes n}-e^{nc}B^{\otimes n}\right)_+ = (\operatorname{Tr}A)^n\operatorname{Tr}\left(\tilde{A}^{\otimes n}-e^{n(c+\log\operatorname{Tr}B-\log\operatorname{Tr}A)}\tilde{B}^{\otimes n}\right)_+. \tag{56}$$

By (15), we have $D^*_\alpha(A\|B)=\log\operatorname{Tr}A-\log\operatorname{Tr}B+D^*_\alpha(\tilde{A}\|\tilde{B})$, and hence $c+\log\operatorname{Tr}B-\log\operatorname{Tr}A\in(D_1(\tilde{A}\|\tilde{B}),D^*_\infty(\tilde{A}\|\tilde{B}))$. Thus, by (56) and Theorem IV.4 in [30], we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}\left(A^{\otimes n}-e^{nc}B^{\otimes n}\right)_+ &= \log\operatorname{Tr}A-\sup_{\alpha>1}\{(c+\log\operatorname{Tr}B-\log\operatorname{Tr}A)(\alpha-1)-\psi^*(\alpha|\tilde{A}\|\tilde{B})\}\\ &= -\sup_{\alpha>1}\{c(\alpha-1)-\psi^*(\alpha|A\|B)\},\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to (14). □

Lemma IV.10 *If ρ and σ satisfy both of the upper and lower factorization properties, we have*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}\rho_n S_n(a) \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n-e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ \geq -\phi(a) \tag{57}$$

for every $a\in\left(\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma),\overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)\right)$.

Proof: Let η denote a common factorization constant for ρ and σ, and let $b\in\mathbb{R}$ be such that $\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma)<a<b<\overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)$. Due to (19), there exist $1<\alpha_1<\alpha_2<+\infty$ such that $\overline{D}_{\alpha_1}(\rho\|\sigma)<a<b<\overline{D}_{\alpha_2}(\rho\|\sigma)$. Note that for every $\alpha>1$,

$$\frac{1}{m}D^*_\alpha\left(\eta^{-1}\rho_n\|\eta\sigma_m\right) = -\frac{1}{m}\log\eta^2+\frac{1}{m}D^*_\alpha\left(\rho_n\|\sigma_m\right)\xrightarrow[m\to+\infty]{}\overline{D}_\alpha(\rho\|\sigma),$$

where the limit follows from (51). Thus we see the existence of an m_b such that for all $m\geq m_b$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{m}D_1(\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m) &\leq \frac{1}{m}D^*_{\alpha_1}\left(\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m\right)\\ &< b < \frac{1}{m}D^*_{\alpha_2}\left(\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m\right) \leq \frac{1}{m}D^*_\infty\left(\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m\right),\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where the first and the last inequalities are due to the monotonicity of the Rényi divergences in the parameter α.

For a fixed $m \geq m_b$, we can write every $n > m$ uniquely as $n = km+r$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Tr} \rho_n S_n(a) &= \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)S_n(a) + e^{na} \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n S_n(a) \\ &\geq \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ \\ &\geq \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_{km} - e^{na}\sigma_{km})_+ \\ &\geq \operatorname{Tr}(\eta^{-k}\rho_m^{\otimes k} - e^{na}\eta^k\sigma_m^{\otimes k})_+, \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where the second inequality follows from the monotonicity (6) and the last inequality is due to the factorization properties and (7). Note that

$$na = (km + r)a \leq kma + ma = km\left(a + \frac{a}{k}\right) < kmb,$$

whenever $k > a/(b-a)$, and for any such k we have

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ \geq \operatorname{Tr}(\eta^{-k}\rho_m^{\otimes k} - e^{kmb}\eta^k\sigma_m^{\otimes k})_+ = \operatorname{Tr}((\eta^{-1}\rho_m)^{\otimes k} - e^{kmb}(\eta\sigma_m)^{\otimes k})_+ \tag{60}$$

due to (59) and (6). By (58), $mb \in (D_1(\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m), D_\infty^*(\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m))$, and hence (60) and lemma IV.9 yield

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ &\geq \frac{1}{m} \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \operatorname{Tr}((\eta^{-1}\rho_m)^{\otimes k} - e^{kmb}(\eta\sigma_m)^{\otimes k})_+ \\ &= -\frac{1}{m} \sup_{\alpha>1} \left\{ mb(\alpha-1) - \psi^*(\alpha|\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m) \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

By (14) and (49) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{m}\psi^*(\alpha|\eta^{-1}\rho_m\|\eta\sigma_m) &= \frac{1}{m}\psi^*(\alpha|\rho_m\|\sigma_m) - \frac{(2\alpha-1)}{m}\log\eta \\ &\geq \overline{\psi}(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) - \frac{(4\alpha-2)}{m}\log\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequality and (61), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ &\geq -\sup_{\alpha>1} \left\{ \left(b + \frac{4}{m}\log\eta\right)(\alpha-1) - \psi^*(\alpha|\rho\|\sigma) \right\} + \frac{2}{m}\log\eta \\ &= -\phi\left(b + \frac{4}{m}\log\eta\right) + \frac{2}{m}\log\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that ϕ is continuous on $\big(\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)\big)$ and $b + \frac{4}{m}\log\eta \in \big(\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)\big)$ for all sufficiently large m. Hence, by taking the limit $m \to \infty$, we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ \geq -\phi(b).$$

Finally, taking the limit $b \searrow a$, we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ \geq -\phi(a). \tag{62}$$

Now (59) and (62) lead to the assertion. □

Theorem IV.11 *Assume that ρ and σ satisfy the factorization property. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \rho_n S_n(a) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr}(\rho_n - e^{na}\sigma_n)_+ = -\phi(a), \tag{63}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n S_n(a) = -(\phi(a) + a) \tag{64}$$

for every $a \in \big(\overline{D}_1(\rho\|\sigma), \overline{D}_\infty(\rho\|\sigma)\big)$. In particular, the conditions of Theorem IV.3 are satisfied with $T_n(a) := S_n(a)$, and hence

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) = H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma), \qquad r \geq 0. \tag{65}$$

Proof: The identities in (63) are immediate from (52) and (57). By (53), $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n S_n(a) \leq -(\phi(a) + a)$, and the same argument as in [30, Theorem IV.5] yields $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \operatorname{Tr} \sigma_n S_n(a) \geq -(\phi(a) + a)$, proving (64). Finally, (65) follows from Theorem IV.3. □

V. EXAMPLES

A. Gibbs states on spin chains

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. A translation-invariant, finite-range *interaction* Φ on $\mathcal{H}$ is specified by a number $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Phi_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes j})$, $j \in [r] := \{1, \dots, r\}$, where each Φ_j is self-adjoint. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the *local Hamiltonian* H_n corresponding to Φ is defined as

$$H_n^\Phi := \sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{k:\, k+j-1 \le n} \Phi_{j,n,k}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad \Phi_{j,n,k} := \left(\otimes_{i=1}^{k-1} I\right) \otimes \Phi_j \otimes \left(\otimes_{i=k+j}^{n} I\right)$$

is the embedding of Φ_j into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$ from the k-th position. The corresponding *local Gibbs state* on n sites at inverse temperature $\beta > 0$ is defined as

$$\omega_n^{\Phi,\beta} := \frac{e^{-\beta H_n^\Phi}}{\operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta H_n^\Phi}}.$$

The *thermodynamic limit (TDL) Gibbs state* $\bar{\omega}_n^{\Phi,\beta}$ on n sites is then given by

$$\operatorname{Tr} A \bar{\omega}_n^{\Phi,\beta} = \lim_{k \to +\infty} \operatorname{Tr} A \omega_{n+k}^{\Phi,\beta}, \qquad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}).$$

The existence and the uniqueness of the TDL Gibbs state was shown in [1, 2]. The following has been shown in [23, Lemma 4.2]:

Lemma V.1 *Let Φ be a translation-invariant, finite-range interaction, and $\omega := \{\omega_n^{\Phi,\beta}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\bar{\omega} := \{\bar{\omega}_n^{\Phi,\beta}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then both ω and $\bar{\omega}$ satisfy the factorization property.*

Lemma V.1 and Theorem IV.11 yield immediately the following:

Theorem V.2 *Let $\Phi^{(1)}$ and $\Phi^{(2)}$ be translation-invariant, finite-range interactions on a finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Let $\rho = \{\omega_n^{\Phi^{(1)},\beta}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ or $\rho = \{\bar{\omega}_n^{\Phi^{(1)},\beta}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and let $\sigma = \{\omega_n^{\Phi^{(2)},\beta}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ or $\sigma = \{\bar{\omega}_n^{\Phi^{(2)},\beta}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then*

$$sc(r|\rho\|\sigma) = H_r^*(\rho\|\sigma).$$

B. Quasi-free states of a fermionic lattice

In this section we consider the hypothesis testing problem for the case where the null-hypothesis is a temperature state of a non-interacting fermionic lattice system and the alternative hypothesis is a product state. For the basics on fermionic quasi-free states, see Appendix B.

Let ω_Q and ω_R be translation-invariant quasi-free states of fermions on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, with symbols $Q, R \in \mathcal{B}(l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu))$. Then Q and R are translation-invariant, and hence there exist measurable functions $q, r : [0, 2\pi)^\nu \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q = F^{-1} M_q F$ and $R = F^{-1} M_r F$, where M_q and M_r denote the corresponding multiplication operators on $L^2([0, 2\pi)^\nu)$, and F is the Fourier transformation (see Section C). To avoid technical complications, we assume that there exists a $c \in (0, 1/2)$ such that $c \le q, r \le 1 - c$ almost everywhere with respect to the Lebesgue measure, or equivalently, $cI \le Q, R \le (1 - c)I$.

The state of the fermions confined to the hypercube $\mathcal{C}_n := \{\mathbf{k} : k_1, \dots, k_\nu = 0, \dots, n-1\}$ is again a quasi-free state, with symbol $Q_n := P_n Q P_n$ or $R_n := P_n R P_n$, where $P_n := \sum_{k_1,\dots,k_\nu=0}^{n-1} |\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}\rangle\langle \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}|$, and $\{\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}\}_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu}$ is the standard basis of $l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)$. These states have density operators on the Fock space $\mathcal{H}_n := \mathcal{F}(\operatorname{ran} P_n)$, given by

$$\omega_{Q_n} = \det(I - Q_n) \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n^\nu} \bigwedge^k \widehat{Q}_n, \qquad \omega_{R_n} = \det(I - R_n) \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n^\nu} \bigwedge^k \widehat{R}_n, \tag{66}$$

where $\widehat{Q}_n := Q_n/(I - Q_n)$, $\widehat{R}_n := Q_n/(I - R_n)$.

With a slight abuse of notation, we identify ω_Q with $\{\omega_{Q_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and ω_R with $\{\omega_{R_n}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. We consider the hypothesis testing problem with

$$H_0: \ \omega_Q \qquad \text{vs.} \qquad H_1: \ \omega_R.$$

Note that the Hilbert space corresponding to one single mode $\mathbf{1_k}$ is $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{ran}\,|\mathbf{1_k}\rangle\langle\mathbf{1_k}|)\cong\mathbb{C}^2$, and

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{ran}\,P_n)\cong\bigotimes_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{C}_n}\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{ran}\,|\mathbf{1_k}\rangle\langle\mathbf{1_k}|)\cong(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes n^\nu}. \tag{67}$$

That is, $\mathcal{H}_n$ is the Hilbert space of n^ν elementary subsystems. Thus, we replace all the $1/n$ scalings in the previous sections with $1/n^\nu$. For instance, we define the strong converse exponent as

$$sc(r|\omega_Q\|\omega_R):=\inf\left\{-\liminf_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\mathrm{Tr}\,\omega_{Q_n}T_n\ \Big|\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\mathrm{Tr}\,\omega_{R_n}T_n\le -r\right\}.$$

It is easy to verify that the results of Section IV A hold true with appropriately modifying all formulas according to this scaling; e.g., the pinched Neyman-Pearson tests have to be defined as $\widehat{S}_n(a):=\{\widehat{\omega}_{Q_n}-e^{n^\nu a}\omega_{R_n}>0\}$, etc.

We start with showing that $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$ exists as a limit, and it is a differentiable function of α for every $\alpha>0$.

Theorem V.3 *Let ω_Q and ω_R be quasi-free states of a fermion system on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, with symbols $Q=F^{-1}M_qF$, $R=F^{-1}M_rF$, and assume that there exists a $c\in(0,1/2)$ such that $c\le q,r\le 1-c$ almost everywhere with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Then for every $\alpha>0$ and $\{v\}=\{\,\}$ or $\{v\}=\{*\}$, we have*

$$\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)=\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}\psi^{\{v\}}(\alpha|\omega_{Q_n}\|\omega_{R_n}) \tag{68}$$

$$=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu}\int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu}\log\left[q(\underline{x})^\alpha r(\underline{x})^{1-\alpha}+(1-q(\underline{x}))^\alpha(1-r(\underline{x}))^{1-\alpha}\right]\,d\underline{x}. \tag{69}$$

Moreover, $\overline{\psi}(.\,|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$ is differentiable on $(0,+\infty)$, and

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha}\Big|_{\alpha=1}\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu}\int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu}\left[q(\underline{x})\log\frac{q(\underline{x})}{r(\underline{x})}+(1-q(\underline{x}))\log\frac{1-q(\underline{x})}{1-r(\underline{x})}\right]\,d\underline{x} \tag{70}$$

$$=\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}D_1\left(\omega_{Q_n}\|\omega_{R_n}\right). \tag{71}$$

Proof: The identities in (68) and (69) for $\{v\}=\{\,\}$, and the identities in (70)–(71) have been shown in [27, Proposition 4.1]. Here we use a similar proof for (68) and (69) in the case $\{v\}=\{*\}$.

For the rest, we fix an $\alpha>0$. Let

$$W_{n,\alpha}:=\left(\frac{Q_n}{1-Q_n}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\frac{R_n}{1-R_n}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\left(\frac{Q_n}{1-Q_n}\right)^{\frac12},\qquad w_\alpha:=\left(\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\frac{r}{1-r}\right)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\left(\frac{q}{1-q}\right)^{\frac12}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n^\nu}\psi^*(\alpha|\omega_{Q_n}\|\omega_{R_n})&=\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\mathrm{Tr}\left(\omega_{Q_n}^{\frac12}\omega_{R_n}^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\omega_{Q_n}^{\frac12}\right)^\alpha\\
&=\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\mathrm{Tr}\left(\left[\det(I-Q_n)\mathcal{F}(\widehat{Q}_n)\right]^{\frac12}\left[\det(I-R_n)\mathcal{F}(\widehat{R}_n)\right]^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\left[\det(I-Q_n)\mathcal{F}(\widehat{Q}_n)\right]^{\frac12}\right)^\alpha\\
&=\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\det(I-Q_n)^\alpha+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\det(I-R_n)^{1-\alpha}+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{F}(W_{n,\alpha}^\alpha)\\
&=\frac{1}{n^\nu}\mathrm{Tr}\log(I-Q_n)^\alpha+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\mathrm{Tr}\log(I-R_n)^{1-\alpha}+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log\det\left(I+W_{n,\alpha}^\alpha\right)\\
&=\frac{1}{n^\nu}\mathrm{Tr}\log(I-Q_n)^\alpha+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\mathrm{Tr}\log(I-R_n)^{1-\alpha}+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\mathrm{Tr}\log\left(I+W_{n,\alpha}^\alpha\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

By lemma C.1, we have

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\left[\frac{1}{n^\nu}\operatorname{Tr}\log(I-Q_n)^\alpha+\frac{1}{n^\nu}\operatorname{Tr}\log(I-R_n)^{1-\alpha}\right]=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu}\int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu}\log\left[(1-q(\underline{x}))^\alpha(1-r(\underline{x}))^{1-\alpha}\right]\,d\underline{x}. \tag{73}$$

To evaluate the limit of the last term in (72), we use Corollary C.2 with $a^{(1)}=q$, $a^{(2)}=r$, $f^{(1)}(t)=(t/(1-t))^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $f^{(2)}(t)=(t/(1-t))^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}$ and $g(x)=\log(1+x^\alpha)$, and obtain

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}\operatorname{Tr}\log\left(I+W_{n,\alpha}^\alpha\right)=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu}\int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu}\log\left(1+\left(\widehat{q}(\underline{x})^{\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{r}(\underline{x})^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}\widehat{q}(\underline{x})^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^\alpha\right), \tag{74}$$

where $\widehat{q}:=q/(1-q)$, $\widehat{r}:=r/(1-r)$. Combining (72), (73), and (74), we get (68)– (69). Differentiability of $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$ is straightforward to verify. □

In particular, Theorem V.3 shows that D_α and D_α^* give rise to the same asymptotic quantities:

Corollary V.4 *In the setting of Theorem V.3, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{D}_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\omega_Q\|\omega_R)&:=\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}D_\alpha^{\{v\}}(\omega_{Q_n}\|\omega_{R_n})\\&=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu}\int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu}\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\log\left[q(\underline{x})^\alpha r(\underline{x})^{1-\alpha}+(1-q(\underline{x}))^\alpha(1-r(\underline{x}))^{1-\alpha}\right]\,d\underline{x}\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

for every $\alpha\in(0,+\infty)\setminus\{1\}$ and $\{v\}=\{\ \}$ or $\{v\}=\{*\}$.

Now we can obtain the strong converse exponent from Theorem IV.4 and Theorem V.3, provided that we can show that $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)=\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$. Unfortunately, at the moment we can only do it by Lemma III.8, for which we have to assume that ω_{R_n} is an i.i.d. state with respect to the factorization (67). It is easy to see that this is equivalent to R being a constant multiple of the identity. Thus we have the following:

Theorem V.5 *Let ω_Q and ω_R be quasi-free states of a fermion system on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, and assume that there exists a $c\in(0,1/2)$ such that $cI\le Q\le(1-c)I$, and that $R=bI$ for some $b\in(0,1)$. Then*

$$sc(r|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)=H_r^*(\omega_Q\|\omega_R)=\sup_{\alpha>1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\left[r-\overline{D}_\alpha(\omega_Q\|\omega_R)\right], \tag{76}$$

where $\overline{D}_\alpha(\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$ is given in (75).

Proof: By Theorem V.3, $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$ exists as a limit for $\alpha>1$, and the limit is differentiable. By (66) and the assumption that $R=bI$,

$$\omega_{R_n}=\det((1-b)I_n)\bigoplus_{k=0}^{n^\nu}\left(\frac{b}{1-b}\right)^k I_{\wedge^k\mathcal{H}_n},$$

and hence its eigenvalues are $b^k(1-b)^{n^\nu-k}$, $k=0,\dots,n^\nu$. In particular, $v(\omega_{R_n})=n^\nu+1$, and thus

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n^\nu}\log v(\omega_{R_n})=0.$$

Hence, by Lemma III.8, $\overline{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)=\widehat{\psi}(\alpha|\omega_Q\|\omega_R)$, and (76) follows from Theorem IV.4. □

Appendix A: Classical large deviations

Let μ_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of finite positive measures on $\mathbb{R}$, and let c_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence of positive numbers such that $\lim_n c_n = +\infty$. For each n, define the *logarithmic moment generating function* Λ_n by

$$\Lambda_n(t) := \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{tx}\, d\mu_n(x).$$

Here we use the convention $\log +\infty := +\infty$. Define

$$\overline{\Lambda}(t) := \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{c_n}\Lambda_n(c_n t), \qquad t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{A1}$$

Hölder's inequality yields that Λ_n is convex for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence $\overline{\Lambda}$ is convex as well.

The following lemma is a standard generalization of the Markov inequality:

Lemma A.1 *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{c_n} \log \mu_n\left([x,+\infty)\right) \le -\sup_{t\ge 0}\{tx - \overline{\Lambda}(t)\}, \tag{A2}$$

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{c_n} \log \mu_n\left((-\infty,x]\right) \le -\sup_{t\le 0}\{tx - \overline{\Lambda}(t)\}. \tag{A3}$$

Proof: For every $t \ge 0$,

$$\mu_n\left([x,+\infty)\right) = \int_x^{+\infty} \mathbf{1}_{[x,+\infty)}(z)\, d\mu_n(z) \le \int_x^{+\infty} e^{c_n t(z-x)}\, d\mu_n(z) \le e^{-c_n t x} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{c_n t z}\, d\mu_n(z),$$

and hence,

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{c_n} \log \mu_n\left([x,+\infty)\right) \le -tx + \limsup_n \frac{1}{c_n} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{c_n t z}\, d\mu_n(z) = -tx + \overline{\Lambda}(t),$$

from which (A2) follows. The proof of (A3) goes the same way. □

The following converse to Lemma A.1 was essentially given in [11], under the stronger (for our purposes too strong) condition that $\overline{\Lambda}$ exists as a limit in a neighbourhood of 0, where it is also differentiable. The more general version below can be easily obtained by following the same line of argument as in [11]. Using the same approach, a generalization of the lower bound in [11] has been obtained in [9], that also generalizes Lemma A.2 below. For readers' convenience, we include a detailed proof below, based on the proof of the Gärtner-Ellis theorem in [13, pp. 49–50].

Lemma A.2 *Assume that $\overline{\Lambda}(t) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n}\Lambda_n(nt)$ in some interval (α,β), and, moreover, that $\overline{\Lambda}$ is a finite-valued differentiable function on (α,β). Then, for every $x \in J := \left(\lim_{t\searrow\alpha} \overline{\Lambda}'(t), \lim_{t\nearrow\beta} \overline{\Lambda}'(t)\right)$, there exists a $t_x \in (\alpha,\beta)$ such that $\overline{\Lambda}'(t_x) = x$, and*

$$\overline{\Lambda}^*(x) := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\{xt - \overline{\Lambda}(t)\} = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{I}}\{xt - \overline{\Lambda}(t)\} = xt_x - \overline{\Lambda}(t_x) > xt - \overline{\Lambda}(t), \tag{A4}$$

where $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is any interval such that $t_x \in \mathcal{I}$, and the last inequality holds for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $t \notin (\alpha,\beta)$ or $\overline{\Lambda}'(t) \ne x$. Moreover, for every $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}\cup\{\pm\infty\}$ such that $x_0 < x < x_1$, we have

$$\liminf_n \frac{1}{c_n} \log \mu_n\left((x,x_1)\right) \ge -\overline{\Lambda}^*(x), \tag{A5}$$

$$\liminf_n \frac{1}{c_n} \log \mu_n\left((x_0,x)\right) \ge -\overline{\Lambda}^*(x). \tag{A6}$$

Proof: Since $\overline{\Lambda}$ is convex, differentiability on (α,β) implies that $\overline{\Lambda}'$ is monotone increasing and continuous on (α,β), and hence for every $x\in J$ there exists a $t_x\in(\alpha,\beta)$ such that $\overline{\Lambda}'(t_x)=x$. The rest of the assertions in (A4) are immediate from the concavity of $t\mapsto xt-\overline{\Lambda}(t)$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Hence, we are left to prove (A5) and (A6), of which we only prove (A5), as the proof of (A6) goes exactly the same way.

Let $x\in J$ and $x_1\in\mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ be such that $x<x_1$. For every $\delta>0$ such that $x+\delta<x_1$, $(x,x+\delta)\subset J$, choose a $y\in(x,x+\delta)$. By the above, there is a $t_y\in(\alpha,\beta)$ corresponding to y such that $\overline{\Lambda}'(t_y)=y$, and hence, $\overline{\Lambda}^*(y)=yt_y-\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)$. Since $\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)<+\infty$, we have $\Lambda_n(c_nt_y)<+\infty$ for all large enough n, and hence we can define the probability measures $\mu_{n,y}$ by

$$\mu_{n,y}(B):=\frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{c_nt_ys}\,d\mu_n(s)}\int_B e^{c_nt_ys}\,d\mu_n(s)=\int_B e^{c_nt_ys-\Lambda_n(c_nt_y)}\,d\mu_n(s),$$

where $B\subset\mathbb{R}$ is any Borel set. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{n,y}\left((x,x+\delta)\right)&=\int_{(x,x+\delta)}e^{c_nt_ys-\Lambda_n(nt_y)}\,d\mu_n(s)=e^{c_nt_yx-\Lambda_n(c_nt_y)}\int_{(x,x+\delta)}e^{c_nt_y(s-x)}\,d\mu_n(s)\\&\le e^{c_nt_yx-\Lambda_n(c_nt_y)}e^{c_n|t_y|\delta}\int_{(x,x+\delta)}d\mu_n(s)\\&=e^{c_nt_yx-\Lambda_n(c_nt_y)}e^{c_n|t_y|\delta}\mu_n\left((x,x+\delta)\right),\end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_n\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_n\left((x,x_1)\right)&\ge\liminf_n\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_n\left((x,x+\delta)\right)\\&\ge\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)-t_yx-|t_y|\delta+\liminf_n\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_{n,y}\left((x,x+\delta)\right),\end{aligned}\tag{A7}$$

where we used that $\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)$ exists as a limit. If we can prove that

$$0>\max\left\{\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_{n,y}\left((-\infty,x]\right),\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_{n,y}\left([x+\delta,+\infty)\right)\right\}\tag{A8}$$

then we have $\lim_{n\to+\infty}\mu_{n,y}\left((x,x+\delta)\right)=1$, and hence, by (A7),

$$\liminf_n\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_n\left((x,x_1)\right)\ge\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)-t_yx-|t_y|\delta>-\overline{\Lambda}^*(x)-|t_y|\delta,$$

where the second inequelity is due to (A4). Using that $|t_y|\delta\to0$ as $\delta\searrow0$, (A5) follows. Hence, we are left to prove (A8).

Let $\Lambda_{n,y}$ denote the logarithmic moment generating function of $\mu_{n,y}$, i.e., for every $t\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\Lambda_{n,y}(c_nt):=\log\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{c_nts}\,d\mu_{n,y}(s)=\log\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{c_nts+c_nt_ys-\Lambda_n(c_nt_y)}\,d\mu_n(s)=\Lambda_n(c_nt+c_nt_y)-\Lambda_n(c_nt_y),$$

and let $\overline{\Lambda}_y(t):=\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{c_n}\Lambda_{n,y}(c_nt)$. By assumption,

$$\overline{\Lambda}_y(t)=\overline{\Lambda}(t+t_y)-\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)\tag{A9}$$

for all t such that $t+t_y\in(\alpha,\beta)$. By lemma A.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_{n,y}\left([x+\delta,+\infty)\right)&\le-\sup_{t\ge0}\{t(x+\delta)-\overline{\Lambda}_y(t)\},\\\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{c_n}\log\mu_{n,y}\left((-\infty,x]\right)&\le-\sup_{t\le0}\{tx-\overline{\Lambda}_y(t)\},\end{aligned}$$

and hence (A8) will be proved if we can show that

$$0<\sup_{t\ge0}\{t(x+\delta)-\overline{\Lambda}_y(t)\}\quad\text{ and }\quad0<\sup_{t\le0}\{tx-\overline{\Lambda}_y(t)\}.\tag{A10}$$

By (A9),

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\geq 0}\{t(x+\delta)-\overline{\Lambda}_y(t)\} &= \sup_{t\geq 0}\{t(x+\delta)-\overline{\Lambda}(t+t_y)+\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)\}\\ &= \overline{\Lambda}(t_y)-(x+\delta)t_y+\sup_{t\geq 0}\{(t+t_y)(x+\delta)-\overline{\Lambda}(t+t_y)\}\\ &= \overline{\Lambda}(t_y)-(x+\delta)t_y+\sup_{t\geq t_y}\{t(x+\delta)-\overline{\Lambda}(t)\}\\ &= \overline{\Lambda}^*(x+\delta)-\{(x+\delta)t_y-\overline{\Lambda}(t_y)\}\\ &> 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the last identity and the inequality follows from (A4), since $\overline{\Lambda}'(t_y) = y < x+\delta$. The other half of (A10) follows by the same kind of argument, which we omit. □

Appendix B: Fermionic quasi-free states

For a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\wedge^k\mathcal{H}$ denote the k-th antisymmetric tensor power of $\mathcal{H}$, with the convention $\wedge^0\mathcal{H} := \mathbb{C}$. Given $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{H}$, their anti-symmetrized tensor product is defined as

$$x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_k := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_{\sigma\in S_k} s(\sigma) x_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \ldots \otimes x_{\sigma(k)},$$

where the sum runs over all permutations of k points. We have $\wedge^k\mathcal{H} = \mathrm{span}\{x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_k : x_i \in \mathcal{H}\}$. The *anti-symmetric-* or *fermionic Fock space* $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\dim\mathcal{H}} \bigwedge^k \mathcal{H},$$

where $\dim\mathcal{H}$ may be countably infinite. Note that $\dim\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) = 2^{\dim\mathcal{H}}$ when $\dim\mathcal{H} < +\infty$, and otherwise $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is countably infinite-dimensional. In the physics terminology, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ is the Hilbert space of a system of at most $\dim\mathcal{H}$ fermions, and the pure state $|x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_k\rangle\langle x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_k|$ describes k fermions in the modes $x_1, \ldots, x_k$.

For each $x \in \mathcal{H}$, the corresponding *creation operator* is defined as the unique bounded linear extension $c^*(x) : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ of

$$c^*(x) : x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_k \mapsto x \wedge x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_k\,, \qquad x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{H},\ k \in \mathbb{N},$$

and the corresponding *annihilation operator* is its adjoint $c(x) := (c^*(x))^*$. The interpretation is that $c^*(x)$ creates a fermion in the mode x. Creation and annihilation operators satisfy the *canonical anticommutation relations (CAR)*: $c(x)c(y) + c(y)c(x) = 0$ and $c(x)c^*(y) + c^*(y)c(x) = \langle x, y\rangle I$ for every $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.

Observable quantities of the system are elements of the algebra $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{H})$ generated by the creation and the annihilation operators. When $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional, $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{H})$ is equal to all the bounded operators on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$. In the infinite-dimensional case, we need to take the closure in some topology; closure in the norm topology yields the so-called *CAR algebra* $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$, which is strictly smaller than the closure in the weak topology, which is $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}))$.

Note that for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $A^{\otimes k}$ leaves $\wedge^k\mathcal{H}$ invariant, and we denote the restriction of $A^{\otimes k}$ onto $\wedge^k\mathcal{H}$ by $\wedge^k A$. If $\|A\| \leq 1$ or $\dim\mathcal{H} < +\infty$ then

$$\mathcal{F}(A) := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\dim\mathcal{H}} \bigwedge^k A$$

is a bounded operator on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$. If $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional and A has eigenvalues $\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_d$, counted with multiplicities, then the eigenvalues of $\wedge^k A$ are $\{\Lambda_{i_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \Lambda_{i_k} : i_1 < \ldots < i_k\}$. Thus we get that in this case

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathcal{F}(A) = \det(I + A).$$

Given an operator $Q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})_+$ such that $Q \leq I$, there exists a unique positive linear functional ω_Q on $\mathrm{CAR}(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\omega_Q(I) = 1$, and for any $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m$,

$$\omega_Q\ (c(x_1)^* \ldots c(x_n)^* c(y_m) \ldots c(y_1)) = \delta_{m,n} \det\{\langle y_i, Q\ x_j\rangle\}_{i,j=1}^n.$$

That is, ω_Q is uniquely determined by its two-point correlation functions on creation and annihiliation operators. Such a functional ω_Q is called a *(gauge-invariant) quasi-free state*, and Q the *symbol* of the state. If $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional then ω_Q can be given by a density operator on $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H})$ which, with a slight abuse of notation, we also denote by ω_Q. If, moreover, $Q < I$ then ω_Q can be written explicitly as

$$\omega_Q = \det(I - Q) \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\dim \mathcal{H}} \bigwedge^k \frac{Q}{I - Q} = \det(I - Q) \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{Q}{I - Q}\right),$$

according to [14, Lemma 3].

The dynamics of a system of non-interacting fermions is determined by a single-particle Hamilton operator, i.e., a self-adjoint operator H on $\mathcal{H}$. Assume for the rest that $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional, and let $H_{k,i} := I^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes H \otimes I^{\otimes(k-i)}$ be the embedding of H into the i-th position in $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$. It is easy to see that $\sum_{i=1}^k H_{k,i}$ leaves $\wedge^k \mathcal{H}$ invariant, and we denote the restriction of $H_{k,i}$ onto $\wedge^k \mathcal{H}$ by $\Gamma_k(H)$, and define the second-quantized Hamiltonian $\Gamma(H) := \oplus_{k=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}} \Gamma_k(\mathcal{H})$. If the initial state of the system is a pure state given by the vector $x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_r$ then the state after time t is the pure state given by the vector $\left(e^{-itH} x_1\right) \wedge \ldots \wedge \left(e^{-itH} x_r\right) = e^{-it\Gamma(H)}(x_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_r)$. Thus, the dynamics of the many-particle system is governed by the Hamiltonian $\Gamma(H)$. Hence, the equilibrium state at inverse temperature β (Gibbs state) is $e^{-\beta\Gamma(H)} / \operatorname{Tr} e^{-\beta\Gamma(H)}$, and a direct computation shows that this is a quasi-free state with

$$Q = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{I + e^{-\beta H}}.$$

Vice versa, any quasi-free state with symbol Q such that $0 < Q < 1$ is the Gibbs state of non-interacting fermions at some inverse temperature β. The infinite-dimensional case is slightly more complicated: it is still true that the equilibrium state of non-interacting fermions at inverse temperature β with one-particle Hamiltonian H is the quasi-free state with symbol $e^{-\beta H}/(I + e^{-\beta H})$, but the equilibrium state in this case is defined through the KMS condition [8, Section 5.2.4].

To describe a system of non-interacting fermions occupying sites of a ν-dimensional cubic lattice, we choose $\mathcal{H} := l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)$. As we have seen, the equilibrium state of the system at any inverse temperature is a quasi-free state, with some symbol $Q \in \mathcal{B}(l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu))$. Let $\{\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}} : \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu\}$ denote the standard basis of $l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)$, and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $P_n := \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_\nu=0}^{n-1} |\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}\rangle\langle \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}|$. The Hilbert space of the fermions occupying sites of the hypercube $\mathcal{C}_n := \{\mathbf{k} : k_1, \ldots, k_\nu = 0, \ldots, n\}$ is then $\mathcal{F}(P_n\mathcal{H})$, and the state of this subsystem is quasi-free with symbol $Q_n := P_n Q P_n$.

The *translation operators* are the unique linear extensions of $S_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}} \mapsto \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{j}\}}$, $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$. The map $\gamma_{\mathbf{j}}(c(x)) := c\,(S_{\mathbf{j}} x)$ extends to an automorphism of $\mathrm{CAR}\big(l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)\big)$ for all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, and $\gamma_{\mathbf{j}}$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, is a group of automorphisms, called the group of *translation automorphisms*. A quasi-free state ω_Q is called *translation-invariant* if $\omega_Q \circ \gamma_{\mathbf{j}} = \omega_Q$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, which holds if and only if its symbol Q is translation-invariant, i.e., it commutes with all the unitaries $S_{\mathbf{j}}$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$.

Appendix C: Generalizations of Szegő's theorem

Translation-invariant operators on $l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)$ commute with each other, and they are simultaneously diagonalized by the Fourier transformation

$$F : l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu) \to L^2([0, 2\pi)^\nu), \quad F\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}} := \varphi_{\mathbf{k}}, \quad \varphi_{\mathbf{k}}(\underline{x}) := e^{i\langle \mathbf{k}, \underline{x}\rangle}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in [0, 2\pi)^\nu, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu,$$

where $\langle \mathbf{k}, \underline{x}\rangle := \sum_{i=1}^\nu k_i x_i$. That is, every translation-invariant operator A arises in the form $A = F^{-1} M_a F$, where M_a denotes the multiplication operator by a bounded measurable function a on $[0, 2\pi)^\nu$. In the rest of this section we use the convention that lower and upper case versions of the same letter refer to a measurable function on $[0, 2\pi)^\nu$ and the Fourier transform of the corresponding multiplication

operator, respectively. Moreover, we use the notation

$$A_n := P_n A P_n, \qquad A \in \mathcal{B}\left(l^2(\mathbb{Z}^\nu)\right), \qquad \text{where} \qquad P_n := \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_\nu=0}^{n-1} |\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}\rangle\langle \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{k}\}}|.$$

Let $\Sigma(A)$ denote the convex hull of the spectrum of a self-adjoint operator A. The following generalization of Szegő's theorem [17] has been shown in [27, lemma 3.1]:

Lemma C.1 *For all $k = 1\ldots, r$, let $a^{(k)} : [0, 2\pi)^\nu \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function, and $f^{(k)} : \Sigma(A^{(k)}) \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} f^{(1)}(A_n^{(1)}) \cdot \ldots \cdot f^{(r)}(A_n^{(r)}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} f^{(1)}(a^{(1)}(\underline{x})) \cdot \ldots \cdot f^{(r)}(a^{(r)}(\underline{x}))\, d\underline{x}. \tag{C1}$$

From this lemma, we can easily get the following:

Corollary C.2 *In the setting of lemma C.1, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} g\left(\left[\prod_{k=1}^r f^{(k)}(A_n^{(k)})\right]\left[\prod_{k=1}^r f^{(k)}(A_n^{(k)})\right]^*\right) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} g\left(\left[\prod_{k=1}^r f^{(k)}(a^{(k)})\right]^2\right) d\underline{x}$$

for any continuous function $g : [0, \Delta] \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\Delta := \prod_{k=1}^r \max_{s\in\Sigma(A^{(k)})} |f^{(k)}(s)|^2$.

Proof: Let $B_n := \prod_{k=1}^r f^{(k)}(A_n^{(k)})$ and $b := \prod_{k=1}^r f^{(k)}(a^{(k)})$. Since g is continuous on $[0, \Delta]$, the Stone-Weierstarss theorem tells that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a polynomial g_ε such that

$$\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_\infty := \max_{x\in[0,\Delta]} |g(x) - g_\varepsilon(x)| < \varepsilon.$$

Now, for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, lemma C.1 yields that there exists an N_ε such that for all $n \geq N_\varepsilon$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} g_\varepsilon\left(B_n B_n^*\right) - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} g_\varepsilon\left(b(\underline{x})^2\right)\, d\underline{x} \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Hence, for every $n \geq N_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} g\left(B_n B_n^*\right) - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} g\left(b(\underline{x})^2\right)\, d\underline{x} \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} g\left(B_n B_n^*\right) - \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} g_\varepsilon\left(B_n B_n^*\right) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n^\nu} \operatorname{Tr} g_\varepsilon\left(B_n B_n^*\right) - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} g_\varepsilon\left(b(\underline{x})^2\right)\, d\underline{x} \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} g_\varepsilon\left(b(\underline{x})^2\right)\, d\underline{x} - \frac{1}{(2\pi)^\nu} \int_{[0,2\pi)^\nu} g\left(b(\underline{x})^2\right)\, d\underline{x} \right| \\
&\leq 2\,\|g - g_\varepsilon\|_\infty + \varepsilon < 3\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MM would like to thank Prof. Fumio Hiai for discussions on the eigenvalues of Gibbs states, and Vincent F. Tan and Marco Tomamichel for pointing out the paper [9]. This work was partially supported by the European Research Council Advanced Grant "IRQUAT" (MM) and by the MEXT Grant-in-Aid (A) No. 20686026 "Project on Multi-user Quantum Network" (TO).

[1] H. Araki, *Gibbs States of a one dimensional quantum lattice*, Commun. Math. Phys. **14**, 120–157, (1969)

[2] H. Araki, *On uniqueness of KMS states of one-dimensional quantum lattice systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. **44**, 1–7, (1975)

[3] K.M.R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, Ll. Masanes, R. Munoz-Tapia, A. Acin, E. Bagan, F. Verstraete.: *Discriminating states: the quantum Chernoff bound*; Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** 160501, (2007)

[4] K.M.R. Audenaert, M. Nussbaum, A. Szkoła, F. Verstraete: *Asymptotic error rates in quantum hypothesis testing*; Commun. Math. Phys. **279**, 251–283 (2008).

[5] R. Bhatia: *Matrix Analysis*; Springer, (1997)

[6] Salman Beigi: *Quantum Rényi divergence satisfies data processing inequality*; J. Math. Phys., **54**, 122202 (2013)

[7] R.E. Blahut: *Hypothesis testing and information theory*; IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory vol. 20, issue 4, pp. 405–417, (1974)

[8] O. Bratteli, D.W. Robinson: *Operator algebras and quantum statistical mechanics II.*; Springer, (1981)

[9] Po-Ning Chen: *Generalization of Gärtner-Ellis Theorem*; IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **46:7**, pp. 2752–2760, (2000)

[10] I. Csiszár: *Generalized cutoff rates and Rényi's information measures*; IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **41**, 26–34, (1995)

[11] Didier Dacunha-Castelle: *Formule de Chernoff pour une suite de variables réelles. In: Grandes Deviations et Applications Statistiques*; Astérisque **68**, pp. 19–24, (1979)

[12] N. Datta: *Min- and Max-Relative Entropies and a New Entanglement Monotone*; IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 2816–2826, (2009).

[13] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni: *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*; *Second ed., Springer, Application of Mathematics, Vol.* **38**, (1998)

[14] B. Dierckx, M. Fannes, M. Pogorzelska: *Fermionic Quasi-free States and Maps in Information Theory*; J. Math. Phys. **49**, 032109, (2008)

[15] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, R.F. Werner: *Finitely correlated states on quantum spin chains*; Commun. Math. Phys. **144**, 443–490, (1992)

[16] Rupert L. Frank and Elliott H. Lieb: *Monotonicity of a relative Rényi entropy*; J. Math. Phys. 54 , 122201, (2013)

[17] U. Grenander, G. Szegő: *Toeplitz Forms and their Applications*; University of California, Berkeley, (1958)

[18] M. Hayashi, T. Ogawa: *On error exponents in quantum hypothesis testing*; IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 50, issue 6, pp. 1368–1372, (2004)

[19] M. Hayashi, *Optimal sequence of POVM's in the sense of Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing*; J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, pp. 10759–10773, (2002).

[20] M. Hayashi, *Quantum Information Theory: An Introduction*; Springer, (2006).

[21] M. Hayashi: *Error exponent in asymmetric quantum hypothesis testing and its application to classical-quantum channel coding*; Phys. Rev. A **76**, 062301, (2007).

[22] F. Hiai, D. Petz: *The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability*; Comm. Math. Phys. **143**, 99–114 (1991).

[23] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, T. Ogawa: *Large deviations and Chernoff bound for certain correlated states on a spin chain*; J. Math. Phys. **48**, (2007)

[24] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, T. Ogawa: *Error exponents in hypothesis testing for correlated states on a spin chain*; J. Math. Phys. **49**, 032112, (2008)

[25] F. Hiai: *Concavity of certain matrix trace and norm functions*; Linear Algebra and Appl. **439**, 1568–1589, (2013)

[26] W. Hoeffding: *On probabilities of large deviations*; Proceedings of Symposium "the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability", pp. 203–219, Berkeley, University of California Press, (1965)

[27] M. Mosonyi, F. Hiai, T. Ogawa, M. Fannes: *Asymptotic distinguishability measures for shift-invariant quasifree states of fermionic lattice systems*; J. Math. Phys. **49**, 072104, (2008)

[28] M. Mosonyi: *Hypothesis testing for Gaussian states on bosonic lattices*; J. Math. Phys. **50**, 032104, (2009)

[29] M. Mosonyi, F. Hiai: *On the quantum Rényi relative entropies and related capacity formulas*; IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, **57**, pp. 2474–2487, (2011)

[30] Milán Mosonyi, Tomohiro Ogawa: *Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum Rényi relative entropies*; arXiv:1309.3228, (2013); to appear in Communications in Mathematical Physics

[31] Milán Mosonyi, *Inequalities for the quantum Rényi divergences with applications to compound coding problems*, arXiv:1310.7525, (2013)

[32] Martin Müller-Lennert, Frédéric Dupuis, Oleg Szehr, Serge Fehr, Marco Tomamichel: *On quantum Renyi entropies: a new definition and some properties*; J. Math. Phys. **54**, 122203, (2013)

[33] H. Nagaoka: *Strong converse theorems in quantum information theory*; in the book "Asymptotic Theory of Quantum Statistical Inference" edited by M. Hayashi, World Scientific, (2005)

[34] H. Nagaoka: *The converse part of the theorem for quantum Hoeffding bound*; quant-ph/0611289

[35] H. Nagaoka, M. Hayashi: *An information-spectrum approach to classical and quantum hypothesis testing for simple hypotheses*; IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **53**, 534–549, (2007)

[36] M. Nussbaum, A. Szkoła: *A lower bound of Chernoff type for symmetric quantum hypothesis testing*; Ann. Statist. **37**, 1040–1057, (2009)
[37] T. Ogawa, H. Nagaoka: *Strong converse and Stein's lemma in quantum hypothesis testing*; IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **47**, 2428–2433 (2000).
[38] M. Ohya, D. Petz: *Quantum Entropy and its Use*; Springer, (1993)
[39] D. Petz: *Quasi-entropies for finite quantum systems*; Rep. Math. Phys. **23**, 57–65, (1986)
[40] A. Rényi: *On measures of entropy and information*; Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob., Vol. I, pp. 547–561, Univ. California Press, Berkeley, California, (1961)
[41] R. Renner: *Security of Quantum Key Distribution*, PhD dissertation, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Diss. ETH No. 16242, (2005).
[42] H. Umegaki: *Conditional expectation in an operator algebra*; Kodai Math. Sem. Rep. **14**, 59–85, (1962)
[43] Alfred Wehrl: *General properties of entropy*; Rev. Mod. Phys. **50**, pp. 221–260, (1978)
[44] Mark M. Wilde, Andreas Winter, Dong Yang: *Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels*; arXiv:1306.1586, to appear in Commun. Math. Phys., (2013)